

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 88-162
H. J. Res. 782

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. J. Res. 162	.1
---	----

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. J. RES. 782

Oct. 28, 1963 Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 782. Print of resolution as passed by House and by Senate.

Committees discharged - no written reports.

Oct. 30, 1963 APPROVED: Public Law 88-162.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued Oct. 29, 1963
For actions of Oct. 28, 1963
88th-1st; No. 172

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1	Expenditures.....6,7	Information.....10,32
Area redevelopment...15,22	Farm labor.....23	Manpower.....27
Budget.....29	Foreign aid.....2	Market news.....3,32
Coffee.....13	Foreign trade...4,14,30,33	Military construction...17
Economic forecasting.....9	Forestry.....31	National parks.....5,12
Electrification.....11,20	Housing.....26	Pay.....19,21
		Personnel.....6,19,21,28
		Poultry.....30
		Reclamation.....16
		Recreation.....5,24
		Research.....25
		Roads.....24
		Stockpiling.....7
		Sugarbeets.....15
		Taxation.....8
		Textiles.....18
		Urban affairs.....26
		Wheat.....4,33

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses passed measure to continue appropriations to Nov. 30. Senate debated foreign aid authorization bill. Sen. Pell urged investigation of USDA market news service. House committee reported bill to implement International Coffee Agreement. Rep. Wyman stated attempt will not be made to obtain court injunction to prevent shipment of surplus agricultural products to Communist countries.

SENATE

- 1. APPROPRIATIONS.** Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 782, to continue until passage of the 1964 appropriations or November 30, whichever occurs first, appropriations for Government agencies. The measure was passed by the House by a vote of 279 to 11. The measure will now be sent to the President. See Digest 95 for an explanation of the coverage of the measure. pp. 19332-3, 19341-8
- 2. FOREIGN AID.** Continued debate on H. R. 7885, the foreign aid authorization bill. pp. 19315-32, 19333-9
Sens. Ellender and Javits submitted amendments intended to be proposed to this bill, H. R. 7885. pp. 1928-1
- 3. MARKET NEWS.** Sen. Beall urged an investigation of the market news service of this Department and stated that the service "should be terminated immediately, and it should be made crystal clear that Congress will not permit other Federal

agencies to adopt similar activities." p. 19283

4. WHEAT. Sen. Pell supported the possible sale of wheat and other "soft" consumer goods to Russia and other Communist nations for "hard" currency and inserted an editorial in support of his position. p. 19307
5. RECREATION. Received from Interior a proposed bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. pp. 19263-4
6. PERSONNEL; EXPENDITURES. Received from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures a report on Federal employment and pay for Sept. pp. 19264-7
7. STOCKPILING. Received from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal expenditures a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of June 1963, including inventories of agricultural commodities. pp. 19267-76
8. TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire inserted a New York Times editorial critical of the tax bill and stating that the Administration "has made little effort to cut back in areas of conspicuous waste, like agriculture, or in the huge outlays for defense and space." pp. 19283-4
9. ECONOMIC FORECASTING. Sen. Proxmire inserted a New York Time's analysis by M. J. Rossant "pointing out the danger and difficulty of basing tax policy on economic forecasting." pp. 19284-5
10. INFORMATION. Sen. Simpson inserted the report of the freedom of information committee of Sigma Delta Chi, the Professional Journalistic Society, stating that "genuine freedom of information is at its lowest ebb today in the history of our Federal Government." pp. 19285-7
11. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Metcalf criticized an editorial in the Industrial News Review concluding that "there is no danger of a power shortage in Montana." pp. 19292-3
12. NATIONAL PARKS. Sen. Byrd, Va., expressed regret that Conrad L. Wirth expects to retire soon as Director of the National Park Service and commended his work in the field of recreation and natural resource conservation. pp. 19295-7

HOUSE

13. COFFEE. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8864, to carry out U.S. obligations under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962 (H. Repts. 870 and 870 pt. 2) pp. 19341, 19379
14. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Wyman criticized the administrations wheat-for-Russia policy but stated that a group of House members have concluded there is no legal basis for obtaining a court injunction against "export licenses for surplus agricultural products to Communist countries." p. 19375
Rep. Staebler inserted George Kennan's letter stating that "the insistence of the Congress that the Yugoslavs be denied even obsolete and surplus items for which they were willing to pay cash has been a major factor in causing them to turn again to Soviet sources of supply." p. 19365

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 782

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 28, 1963

Mr. CANNON introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations

OCTOBER 28, 1963

Committee discharged; considered and passed

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964,
and for other purposes.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the joint resolution of August 28, 1963 (Public Law
4 88-109), is hereby amended by striking out "October 31,
5 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 30, 1963".

I

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CANNON

OCTOBER 28, 1963

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations

OCTOBER 28, 1963

Committee discharged; considered and passed

H. J. RES. 782

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 28 (legislative day, OCTOBER 22), 1963

Received; read twice, considered, read the third time, and passed

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964,
and for other purposes.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the joint resolution of August 28, 1963 (Public Law
4 88-109), is hereby amended by striking out “October 31,
5 1963” and inserting in lieu thereof “November 30, 1963”.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. J. RES. 782

JOINT RESOLUTION

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal
year 1964, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 28 (legislative day, OCTOBER 22), 1963

Received; read twice, considered, read the third time,
and passed

nationalization or expropriation or confiscation; injurious, discriminatory, or other actions which would result in such expropriations in areas where we are giving aid.

This is an extremely desirable idea. It is reflected also in the report of the Clay Committee, which urged us not to aid a foreign government in projects establishing government-owned industrial or commercial enterprises which compete with existing private enterprise; therefore, clearly or by implication it does not want American endeavors of private character dismantled.

Those are all desirable, useful, and important provisions. However, they still do not bring the private enterprise system appreciably into the foreign aid program. That is the only way in which the program can be effectively re-oriented.

From everything I can see, we are in for a foreign aid program for another decade, at least, and perhaps longer. If that is the case, I doubt very much whether it will survive year after year the attacks which are constantly accelerating in their intensity, such as the one being made here, and in the other body, and which will be made on the appropriation bill for foreign aid.

I believe that we must have, from the administration or from a commission source, a recommendation as to how the program may be reshaped and revamped in the public interest.

In my judgment, that means a heavy implementation with the private enterprise system as the means through which the program will be carried out.

The lines of this program are very clearly indicated by the proposal, for example, that development loans may be channeled through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, something which, a decade ago, was recommended by Christian Herter, who later became Secretary of State, and me in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. If it takes 10 years to get a simple proposal like that through, that is perhaps some indication of the length of time which will be necessary to bring about a really effective participation by the private enterprise system in foreign aid.

Before I complete my preliminary statement on the bill, I wish to refer to one other amendment in which I have joined with the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], which I think is a matter of the most critical importance to us. The amendment was contained in the House bill but was stricken by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It will be Senator GRUENING's purpose and mine to restore it. The amendment, which appears in the language stricken from the House bill on pages 18 and 19 of the bill, reads:

No assistance shall be provided under this or any other act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against—

- (1) the United States,
- (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other act, or

(3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954,

until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act.

This provision is directed against accelerating arms races, especially the accelerating arms race in the Near East to which the United Arab Republic is the principal party. Let us make it clear that the President has the power to cut off aid in a situation where our aid is filling in for the resources of a country which are being diverted for the purpose of aggressive military preparations. The fact is that the President has not taken this action in the case of the United Arab Republic. Therefore, he must be directed to take such action; otherwise he will not do it.

We had a precatory request to the President to do just such a thing in the bill up to now. It reads:

It is the sense of the Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those countries which share the view of the United States on the world crisis and which do not, as a result of United States assistance, divert their own economic resources to military or propaganda efforts directed against the United States or against other countries receiving aid under this Act, whether or not such efforts are supported by the Soviet Union or Communist China.

That language was directed against an escalation of the arms race in the Near East; but that provision, too, is now out of the bill, and the Committee on Foreign Relations has not restored it. So there is neither a sense request or a statutory provision in the bill today to deal with this situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator explain what the situation would be in regard to the present altercation between Algeria and Morocco, both of which have been receiving assistance, or surplus food, at least, from the United States? Would the Senator's amendment require the United States to shut off aid to both countries?

Mr. JAVITS. It might very well, and quite properly so.

Mr. AIKEN. Until they stopped fighting?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not see any reason why such action might not have a salutary effect on both participants. The amendment would give the President a directive to shut off aid, where the aid which we are given presents the recipient nation with resources for "aggressive" military efforts. Conceivably, the President could make a determination that one of those countries was the aggressor. But the Senator from Vermont is probably much more correct when he says that the provision would result in cutting off aid to both countries.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be very diffi-

cult to judge which country was the aggressor.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree. I would not beg the question. Probably it would be impolitic for the President to decide which country was the aggressor.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think he could decide.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a rhetorical question: Does he not think the American people would have much more respect for the foreign aid program if it were used in such a way that it did not preempt the resources that are used to fill in for resources in a particular country, resources which were then diverted to forward an aggressive military effort?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I think the American people would be—and are—very much opposed to the United States rendering assistance to any nation for the purpose of perpetuating or creating war. It goes without saying that we have contributed to wars in many parts of the globe through enabling one side or the other to continue fighting, when perhaps, except for our assistance, they might not have been able to keep those wars going. I suppose we might call them little wars or brush fire wars; nevertheless, I am sure the American people object to our assistance being used for any such purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I could not agree with him more.

I point out what this "sense" resolution which is contained in the foreign aid bill now, in the absence of a prohibiting amendment such as passed by the House, and which the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I will move in the Senate, has resulted in. In the first place, it has provided surplus foods to the United Arab Republic, notwithstanding the fact that that country is sending troops into Yemen and has interfered directly in the affairs of a revolution in Yemen, with great mischief to us and our policy, and notwithstanding the fact that the United Arab Republic has committed aggression against Saudi Arabia.

The Senator from Vermont has referred to the situation of Algeria and Morocco, both of which are receiving surplus food aid.

The United Arab Republic is arming. It is buying arms openly from the Soviet Union. A report as recently as today indicates that the United Arab Republic is sending arms, planes, and troops to be ready to aid President Ben Bella in Algeria, in his war with Morocco. Nonetheless, the United States continues to give aid to the United Arab Republic. Moreover, President Nasser, of the United Arab Republic, constantly reiterates that the one basis for Arab unity is to drive the Israelis into the sea and, by armed aggression, to eliminate Israel as a state. He means it, as we know very well from the many demonstrable acts which have been taken in pursuance of that design, including the effort to subvert both Jordan and Saudi Arabia, the effort to unite Syria with the United Arab Republic, and the effort to bring about great Egyptian influence in Iraq.

and Iran. That is what is popularly called Nasserism.

Nonetheless, the U.S. aid program continues. Our aim in the aid program is to assist free nations. That objective is lost when one nation which we are trying to help dissipates its resources in aggression or preparation for aggression against another nation which we are also trying to help.

It seems to me that, knowing what we face, we cannot allow that situation to continue. It is calculated, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] so very properly said, to depreciate the quality, character, and backbone of the aid program in the eyes of the American people.

I hope very much that we shall be successful in having this amendment restored to the Senate version of the bill, so that there may be agreement between the Senate and the House upon this section.

I should like to conclude as I began. We cannot rebuild the house of foreign aid while the house is being used. What we must do is to design a new building out of the present one. In my judgment, the new one must be based heavily on the private enterprise system, which has not been adequately used in respect to foreign aid.

I welcome the Senate committee amendments to accelerate and improve utilization of the private enterprise system, for, fundamentally, foreign economic aid is a business operation, and it can be carried on, and should be carried on, in the closest cooperation with American business. When the program is operated on that basis, it will gain the greatest respect from the American people. Furthermore, by implementing our foreign aid through the operations of American business, we shall also enlist the great resources of American business, and thus will improve the ability of American business to make contributions both of brains and of tangible aid to this program.

Finally, Mr. President, when we consider the argument that it is better to have this program as it now stands, rather than to permit a gap to occur between the present program and the development of a better one to succeed it, I point out that if we now were to suspend foreign aid, the vacuum thus caused would quickly be filled, but not by us; instead, it would be filled by our competitor, the Soviet Communist system. The nations of Europe may not give us, every day, their thanks for our foreign aid, even though we deserve them; but that is a rather superficial point, as compared to keeping them on the side of the free world by enabling them to have viable economies under this system, whereas in the absence of this system they will turn to the Communist system; and we cannot afford to allow them to do that, even if this program is not as economical or as efficient or as effective as it should be.

So, Mr. President, I favor this program, and we must favor it, until something better is available, even though our failure to devise an improved program is a great mistake; and at one and the same time I shall fight shoulder to shoulder with other Senators in the ef-

fort to build a better structure to do this job. However, I cannot favor dismantling this program while we try to build up a better one.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on June 25, 1963, the Senate and House of Representatives passed and sent to the President a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the months of July and August since most of the appropriation bills had not been enacted into law at that time. Subsequently, on August 27 of this year, that resolution—Public Law 88-55—was amended by extending the authority thereunder until October 31, 1963.

Today, the House of Representatives has passed and sent to the Senate, House Joint Resolution 782, the effect of which will continue until November 30, 1963, appropriations for those functions of the Government for which funds have not been enacted into law.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 782.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 782) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of August 28, 1963 (Public Law 88-109), is hereby amended by striking out "October 31, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 30, 1963".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this joint resolution is similar to continuing resolutions which we have agreed to on two other occasions this year, and to others in prior years, and provides for the continuation of appropriations during November, 1963, as follows:

In those instances when bills have passed both bodies and the amounts or authority therein differ, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser of the two amounts approved or under the more restrictive authority.

When a bill has passed only one House, or when an item is included in only one version of the bill as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate of operations not exceeding the fiscal 1963 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is lower.

In instances when neither House has passed appropriations bills for fiscal 1964, amounts are approved for continuing projects or activities conducted in fiscal 1963 not in excess of the current year's rate or at the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I would like to report the status of the various appropriations for fiscal year 1964:

Enacted into law are the regular appropriation bills for the Interior, Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense Departments, and their related agencies.

There are two bills which have passed both Houses—the legislative branch and Department of Agriculture appropriation bills—and conferences with the House have been requested by the Senate.

Three bills are presently in the Senate Appropriations Committee. Hearings are in progress on the Independent offices and Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary appropriation bills, and it is expected that the District of Columbia appropriation bill will be ready for markup within the next week or so.

Still remaining in the House Committee, pending finalization of the authorization process, are the foreign aid, public works, and military construction appropriation bills.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has consulted with me, as the senior member of the committee on the Republican side of the aisle, in relation to the joint resolution. I believe that the Senate must pass the joint resolution. We cannot do otherwise because the appropriation bills referred to are still pending.

As I said to the distinguished chairman of the committee, for whom I have the utmost respect, I believe that we should not have to pass another joint resolution of the character of the one now before the Senate. It does not help Congress to have appropriation bills that were due to be passed before July 1 of 1963 pending for 5 months after they became due, so that we are asked to act on resolutions that would authorize the various departments of the Government to spend money on the basis of last year's appropriations or on the basis of the recommendations of the President, whichever amounts are lower. I do not believe that action gives us an opportunity to operate our Government as efficiently as possible. So I say that the Senate cannot do otherwise than to pass the joint resolution. The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona

[Mr. HAYDEN], for whom we all have the utmost regard, agrees with me that that is not a process which helps the prestige of the Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Arizona, whose position I completely support in asking for the continuing resolution, that I have been puzzled to know what is happening with reference to some of the conferences which the Senate requested. For example, the Senate on June 26 passed the legislative appropriation bill. There has been no conference. There has been no appointment of conferees on the part of the other body up to this time.

On September 30, the Senate passed the bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. As the Senator knows, I happened to handle that bill on the floor of the Senate. The House has not yet appointed conferees. On inquiry of the staff we find that probably no conferees will be appointed until after Armistice Day. Does the Senator know, or is he able to state for the RECORD, why we are encountering such long and unforeseen delays in the setting up of conferences for which the Senate has asked and on which the Senate has appointed conferees?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am in complete ignorance as to what motivated the House to cause the delay on those two bills. With respect to some of the other bills, the delay results from lack of an authorization act.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is in exactly that same situation. He wanted to call attention to the fact that the Senate not only passed those two bills some time ago, appointed conferees on the part of the Senate, and asked for a conference with the House, but also that we have been trying to move ahead ever since, without avail, up to the present time. I deeply regret the delay.

Mr. HAYDEN. There will be either a continuing resolution for the next Congress, or we shall have to pass those bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 782—was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

THE PROPOSED SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT AND A REPLACEMENT FOR THE OUTMODED DC-3

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, recently several airlines in the United States have expressed the intention of purchasing early models of an American-built supersonic transport aircraft, the production of which will be carefully monitored by the Federal Aviation Agency. Trans World Airlines, the first firm to make known its intention to buy the high-speed aircraft, has now been joined by Pan American Airways and by American Airlines.

The Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, under the chairmanship of the capable Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], is currently holding hearings to better determine the progress and promise in this imaginative and important project.

The intent of our aviation firms to purchase a domestically built supersonic transport has far-reaching implications for the economy. At a time when our balance of payments must be improved, and the aviation leadership of the United States is seriously challenged by the development of the "Concorde" through the joint effort of the British and French, it is imperative that we take thoughtful action.

The expeditious and efficient construction of an American-built supersonic transport will enable this country to compete favorably with foreign airlines in the transcontinental travel market, and with foreign production of a similar plane. The major airlines who have thus indicated confidence in U.S. industry's ability to produce this advanced aircraft have done much to add impetus to the completion of a finished product. They have hastened the day when our citizens, and those of other lands may enjoy the fruits of American ingenuity and know-how.

Another area of air transportation which is receiving needed study by elements of the Federal Government and private industry, is the development of a suitable airplane to replace the faithful but outmoded DC-3. In this area, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has exercised vigorous leadership. Construction of such a plane would contribute to the service and convenience available to travelers in smaller cities and areas not normally served by large metropolitan airports.

It is encouraging to note that the Federal Aviation Agency is energetic in its support of a DC-3 replacement program, and that this diligent governmental agency believes such an aircraft would be, in their terms, "short-haul, safe, subsonic, and subsidy saving." I concur in this thumbnail sketch of a vitally needed adjunct to the aerial capability of the United States, and urge that significant emphasis be placed on its construction, as well as on that of the supersonic transport. West Virginia, and the Nation, would benefit from such a dual-purposed program of technological progress.

I commend the interest of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the members of his subcommittee on that study as well as their study of the supersonic plane.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

FOREIGN AID MEMO SENT TO U.S. EDITORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week the senior Senator from New York

[Mr. JAVITS] and I sent out a letter and memorandum to over 600 American newspaper editors calling to their attention certain basic facts about the foreign aid program. As I will be speaking later this week on the substantive points covered in the memorandum, I will not do so at this time.

However, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have the text of the letter and memorandum printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1963.

DEAR —: We believe there is an extraordinary need at this point to encourage better public understanding of the importance of the U.S. foreign aid program to the security and well-being of our country, and how U.S. private enterprise and voluntary organizations carry out their important role in it. So much emphasis has been given to foreign aid problems—both real and imagined—that there has been a failure to appreciate the value of its performance.

For the purpose of contributing to a more balanced perspective on this subject, we enclose with this letter a memorandum on foreign aid. It comments briefly on some of the current criticisms of the program and outlines in plain terms the factors which have caused us and many other public officials, whether Democrats or Republicans, to give it continued support. We submit this case for foreign aid for your consideration, mindful of the responsibilities we share to be informed of and weigh the important foreign policy developments of our times and to bring them fairly before the American people. For the foreign aid program has been traditionally bipartisan from the beginning and today foreign aid is called for by President Kennedy and supported by former President Eisenhower.

In the period ahead, the Senate will complete action on this year's foreign aid authorization and, thereafter, both the House and Senate will consider the bill at the appropriations stage. This is a particularly vital time for public consideration of foreign aid. It is our hope that this letter and memorandum will bring increased understanding to that consideration.

Sincerely yours,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senator.
JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

A CASE FOR FOREIGN AID

FOREIGN AID IS ESSENTIAL TO U.S. SECURITY

Contrary to charges that the foreign aid program is a "global giveaway," it is essentially a means to advance the security and well-being of the United States and the free world. Comprised of both economic and military aid, it is a vital arm of U.S. foreign policy which seeks to win the cold war and prevent hot wars.

This is why President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower support foreign aid so strongly, why President Eisenhower recently said: "Never has there been any question in my mind as to the necessity of a program of economic and military aid to keep the free nations of the world from being overrun by the Communists. It is that simple."

This is why the main finding in the Clay Committee report is that a sound foreign aid program is "essential to the security of our Nation and necessary to the exercise of its worldwide responsibilities."

**FOREIGN AID IS AN INDISPENSABLE INSTRUMENT
OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN CRITICAL AREAS OF
THE WORLD**

A good example is found in the aid given through the Alliance for Progress to Latin America, the area described by President Kennedy as the "most critical in the world." In the face of anti-U.S. propaganda from Castro-Communist forces, U.S.-backed projects there have demonstrated our concern for Latin America's welfare. In the brief 2 years since this hemispheric cooperative effort was launched, some 140,000 new housing units have been constructed, 8,200 new school classrooms have been built, and more than 700 new community water systems undertaken. Tax and land reform measures have been adopted by many countries, more than 160,000 agricultural credit loans have been made, 4 million schoolbooks have been distributed, and more than 9 million children are being fed in 18 countries under the food for peace program.

The concrete results of our participation in the Alliance for Progress program can be illustrated by two examples:

1. Before the Alliance was launched, a shack in a Bogotá, Colombia, slum was the home of Campo Elias Bernal, his wife and his six children. Their total family income: \$1 a day. Now, 2 years later, the Bernals are living in a modest but clean and facilities-equipped home in Ciudad Techo, an Alliance housing project near the Colombian capital. Priced at \$630 and financed over a 15-year period, the Bernals are building their home through a system of self-help home construction widely employed under the Alliance throughout Latin America.

2. In Brazil, the misery of the Favela Bom Jesus until 2 years ago was typical of the slums ringing Latin American cities. Today this favela has been crushed by bulldozers and its inhabitants live in Barrio Alianca, a housing development near Rio de Janeiro named after the Alliance for Progress. It is a cooperative endeavor of a private foundation, the State Government of Guanabara and the United States.

**FOREIGN AID SUPPLEMENTS U.S. MILITARY
STRENGTH AROUND THE WORLD AND REDUCES
THE LIKELIHOOD U.S. FORCES WILL HAVE TO
BE USED IN COMBAT**

Military opinion is that without foreign aid, we either would have to tolerate Communist takeovers in various countries or commit American troops to fight brushfire wars there with weak local allies. Our aid supports 3½ million foreign troops who stand guard along Communist-bloc borders where U.S. troops might otherwise have to be stationed.

Through guerilla warfare and stealthy subversion, communism uses human misery in unstable countries for its own ends. U.S. military aid to strengthen foreign forces and U.S. economic assistance to advance economic and social progress helps keep Communist and other radical movements from gaining the upper hand. Obviously, our aid alone is not sufficient, but it's one of our most effective weapons.

U.S. military aid supports foreign troops in countries facing the Communist bloc—from Greece and Turkey to Korea—at a price one-tenth that of maintaining comparable numbers of U.S. soldiers there. Were it not for foreign forces supported by our military assistance, it would be necessary to consider substantial expansion of our own forces at heavy costs in manpower and funds.

While the test ban treaty debate has evidenced concern for military safeguards for U.S. strength as against Communist power, it is often forgotten that our military aid is part of this safeguard and that economic aid is one of the chief nonmilitary safeguards for U.S. security and peace. The Communists may be expected to intensify their cold war efforts in the developing countries. In this situation, foreign eco-

nomics aid is more important than ever as a safeguard against increased Communist influence.

**FOREIGN AID IS GOOD BUSINESS FOR THE UNITED
STATES—IT MEANS MORE U.S. EXPORTS, MORE
U.S. MARKETS ABROAD, AND MORE U.S. JOBS**

Foreign aid purchases in the United States help account for the jobs of more than 550,000 American wage earners.

In 1962, for example, the Agency for International Development (AID) financed 25 percent of U.S. iron and steel mill product exports, 38 percent of our exports of fertilizer and locomotives, \$50 million in foreign purchases of U.S.-manufactured electrical apparatus, and 10 percent of U.S. truck and bus exports.

The military assistance program also helps U.S. business. In addition to about \$1 billion in procurement financed by the program itself, military assistance activities will contribute to cash and credit sales to allied governments this fiscal year expected to amount to about an additional \$1.2 billion worth of U.S. military goods and services.

The percentage of aid-financed U.S. exports is rising sharply. AID financing of American commodities from fiscal year 1962 to 1964 will almost double, rising from about \$500 million to \$1 billion a year.

Foreign aid-financed U.S. exports help make American products more familiar to and desired by buyers in other countries. AID financed almost one-tenth of America's \$7.5 billion of exports to underdeveloped free world countries in 1962. Foreign aid also helps develop growing economies which are better markets for American products. After postwar U.S. aid to Europe and Japan, U.S. exports to Europe doubled between 1959 and 1962, and American exports to Japan tripled in the last decade.

Can the United States afford substantial foreign aid expenditures in light of the current budget deficit?

Yes, since substantial aid cuts now would create later costs which would far exceed any immediate savings.

There are a number of countries where our aid is a decisive barrier to Communist takeover in the short or longer term. The cost of Communist gains in Cuba—a single small country—has been enormous both to the U.S. Government and to U.S. business there. The month's cost of mobilizing U.S. forces at the time of Khrushchev's missile threat last October would sustain aid programs in a number of countries.

The annual dollar cost of even a limited war in a single country might far exceed worldwide foreign aid costs for several years and result in immeasurable costs in American lives. The Korean conflict alone cost four times the total foreign aid request this year.

We have three-fourths of a million men in our Armed Forces stationed outside the United States. The foreign aid program is one of our best means of insuring that these men will not have to fight full scale wars. Its support of foreign troops also reduces the number of U.S. troops needed abroad and the expense of maintaining them there.

The United States spends \$50 billion a year for defense to be prepared for wars we hope we never have to fight. We spend about 8 percent of that for foreign aid to reduce the probability of war and to maintain the initiative in the cold war. Military assistance makes as great a contribution to U.S. security, dollar for dollar, as the funds in our own defense budget. The cost involved in both programs is the price of our own security.

**THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM PROPOSED THIS YEAR
IS SMALLER THAN THE AVERAGE PROPOSAL OF
PAST YEARS**

This year's request is less than the amount requested in 10 of the 15 fiscal years since the Marshall plan began. It is about \$1 bil-

lion less than the average request over the last 15 years, 4 of which were over \$7.5 billion.

The United States today is spending 10 percent of its gross national product (GNP) to improve its national security. Only one-twelfth of this spending goes for foreign aid, and almost half of even this amount is for military and related strategic aid. The request for military aid is only 3 percent of the regular defense budget.

Foreign aid expenditures have declined as a percentage of U.S. gross national product from almost 2 percent at the beginning of the Marshall plan to seven-tenths of 1 percent today, as a share of the Federal budget from 11.5 percent in 1949 to 4.1 percent today.

**FOREIGN AID IS NOT NOW A MAJOR CAUSE OF OUR
SERIOUS BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM AND
GOLD OUTFLOW**

While aid has been an important contributory cause in the past, policy changes since 1959 and especially in the last year have achieved the result now that 90 percent of all aid commitments goes to purchase U.S. goods and services. Thus a cut of \$1 billion in foreign aid would cut \$100 million from the deficit in the balance of payments but \$900 million from U.S. exports. Even if surplus agricultural commodities, military aid, and Export-Import Bank loans are omitted, 8 out of every 10 economic aid dollars are spent in the United States. Moreover, the U.S. share of actual total AID expenditures has been rising at a rate of about 10 percent yearly, and the military assistance program now has reached the point where it actually helps our balance-of-payments position. The present payments problem is a serious one, but it cannot be laid at the doorstep of foreign aid.

**SHARP CUTS IN THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM
WOULD DO SEVERE DAMAGE**

Despite the recommendation of a \$4.1 billion program by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the program was slashed to \$3.5 billion on the House floor. This heavy cut raises many dangers:

In the Alliance for Progress, the 25-percent cut to \$450 million would mean that fewer funds would be available this year than last year, though the opportunities for useful investment in Latin America are substantially increasing, not decreasing;

Would indicate that just when the Alliance is demonstrating real progress and after U.S. criticism of Latin American performance, it is the United States which appears to pull back from its Alliance pledges;

Would reduce U.S. aid to all 19 Latin American countries under the Alliance this year to about the amount of Communist aid to the single island of Cuba; and

Would weaken pro-U.S. and pro-Alliance forces in Latin America and be a boon to Castro and the Communists. In gloating over the recent cut, one Communist newspaper wrote: "Only the naive and servile can continue to believe in the Alliance for Progress." Fidel Castro himself, attacking the Alliance on July 26 of this year as "an instrument of aggression against the Cuban revolution," scoffed that "the North American treasury every day is more incapable of mobilizing resources that will permit it to sustain * * * its allies in these countries."

In military assistance, a \$400 million cut in this fiscal year to \$7 billion would place the United States in a position of reducing assistance to its allies at a time when Communist threats to free world security are backed by an improving arsenal. About 70 percent of total military assistance in fiscal year 1964 (and almost 80 percent of associated supporting assistance) was planned to go to nine key countries on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc. None of these countries has the resources to maintain the forces which our own Joint Chiefs of Staff

House of Representatives

MONDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Isaac Freeman, Congregation Agudas Achim, Newburgh, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, impart Thy protection and wisdom to the chosen Representatives of the American people. Accept our thanksgiving for the opportunity to extend Thy gifts of material and spiritual bounty to the enrichment of human life and culture.

We pray that Thou wilt quicken and sustain within us the understanding and awe that the seeds of the future are contained in this present hour—that each act and decision embodies the potentiality of both blessing and curse. Grant us reverence for the goodness woven into the souls of men and the courage to be faithful to that reverence. May the well-springs of our life be rooted in Thy eternity so that in word and deed, Thy dwelling place may ever be manifest in our midst.

May the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable unto Thee, our Rock and our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 24, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2073. An act to place certain submerged lands within the jurisdiction of the governments of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 569. An act to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to extend the provisions of title II relating to cancellation of loans under such title to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education, and to authorize for teachers in private nonprofit schools certain benefits under the provisions of titles V and VI of such act provided for teachers in public schools.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 168, 88th Congress, had appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. FONG as a delegation to attend the general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary As-

sociation, to be held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya, beginning November 4, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, pursuant to said resolution, designated Mr. FULBRIGHT as the chairman of said delegation.

TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 6500, an act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, HEBERT, ARENDS, NORBLAD, and BATES.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON H.R. 8864, INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1963

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may file a supplemental report to accompany House Report No. 870 on H.R. 8864 so as to include therein the additional views of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] which were inadvertently omitted in the filing of the report of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, we are today about to bring up before the House a continuing resolution for appropriations for certain departments of the Government. I sincerely hope those of us who are vitally interested in trying to find out why we are approaching the 5th month of this fiscal year and the majority party has not brought appropriation bills before this House. I think we ought to know all of the reasons, then have a record vote so that we may be able to express ourselves as we rightfully

should. If reasons or explanations are not forthcoming from the Democratic leadership, then I cannot vote for this continuing resolution.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 182]

Abbitt	Gonzalez	Morrison
Abernethy	Grant	Multer
Addabbo	Green, Oreg.	Nelsen
Avery	Green, Pa.	Nix
Ayres	Griffin	O'Brien, Ill.
Barling	Griffiths	O'Brien, N.Y.
Barry	Gurney	Osmer
Battin	Hagen, Calif.	Patten
Bolling	Hall	Pelly
Bolton,	Halleck	Pepper
Frances P.	Harding	Pilcher
Bolton,	Harris	Powell
Oliver P.	Harvey, Ind.	Quie
Bonner	Harvey, Mich.	Quillen
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Reid, Ill.
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Reifel
Buckley	Herlong	Riehlman
Burton	Hoeven	Rivers, S.C.
Carey	Hoffman	Roberts, Ala.
Celler	Horan	Roberts, Tex.
Clark	Hull	Roosevelt
Clausen,	Hutchinson	Rosenthal
Don H.	Jarman	Roudebush
Cooley	Jennings	Ryan, N.Y.
Cramer	Johnson, Calif.	St. Onge
Curtis	Kelly	Schneebell
Daddario	Keogh	Shelley
Delaney	Kilburn	Sibal
Diggs	King, N.Y.	Skubitz
Dingell	Kluczynski	Springer
Dorn	Kornegay	Stafford
Downing	Landrum	Stinson
Dwyer	Lesinski	Taft
Evins	Long, La.	Taylor
Fallon	McDade	Thompson, La.
Farbstein	McDowell	Thornberry
Feighan	McIntire	Tollefson
Fino	Macdonald	Tupper
Flynt	MacGregor	Utt
Ford	Madden	Wallhauser
Foreman	Mailliard	Whalley
Fountain	Martin, Mass.	White
Fulton, Tenn.	May	Wickersham
Fuqua	Miller, N.Y.	Widnall
Garmatz	Minshall	Williams
Gary	Monagan	Wright
Gibbons	Montoya	
Gill	Moore	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 293 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN DEPARTMENTS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted by the House I call up House Joint Resolution 782, a

joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that this House joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of August 28, 1963 (Public Law 88-109), is hereby amended by striking out "October 31, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 30, 1963".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution for 1 month, the month of November. It is the third continuing resolution during this session. We had a continuing resolution for July and August, a second one for September and October, and the pending resolution would bring us down to December 1, next.

The following bills for fiscal 1964 have been passed by both Houses and signed by the President: The appropriation bills for the Department of Interior, the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Labor and HEW Departments, and the Defense Department.

Two of the supply bills are now on the Speaker's table awaiting conference—the legislative appropriation bill and the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Three have passed the House and are now in the Senate awaiting action by that body—State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary; the District of Columbia bill and the independent offices bill.

This leaves four supply bills for the year still awaiting action by the House, the public works bill, the military construction bill, the foreign aid bill, and then, as nearly always, the closing supplemental bill.

There is no difference of substance between the pending resolution and the two previously acted on by the House. The phraseology is identical. The provisions are the same. The only change made is the 30-day extension to include the month of November.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Has the gentleman discussed with Members of the other body the possibility of getting these appropriations out at an early date?

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the main reason the four bills await action by the House is that we do not have the necessary authorizations. The legislative committees bring in the authorization bills and they must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before it is in order to bring in the appropriations. We cannot appropriate a single dollar until it is authorized by law. The authorization bills are holding us up. We must await authorization. The Senate is as fully aware of that act as we are.

It is a great body, a very deliberative body. And they have been holding hearings on the three appropriation bills now over there. As soon as the remaining authorization bills are disposed of we are going to bring in the remaining appropriation bills.

Mr. BASS. I appreciate that the Committee on Appropriations cannot under the rules report out the bills until the related authorization bills are approved. However, this seems to be a great and a continuous practice of not being able to get our legislation and appropriations finished prior to the beginning of the fiscal year. Since it looks like we are beginning to stay in session all year, I wonder what the chairman would think about revising the bookkeeping of the Government and putting it on a calendar-year instead of a fiscal-year basis, so that these departments can know at the beginning of the year of operation exactly what the situation is going to be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CANNON was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CANNON. That would depend on the wishes of the House and of the Senate. I do not suppose the gentleman was here at the time, but many of us were here under the old constitutional provision when every other year the House had to adjourn by noon on the 4th of March. We convened in early December, passed all the essential legislation and all the appropriation bills. There was not a single instance that I recall in the last 50 years in which we failed by the 4th of March to dispose of all necessary business. Then we went home. We met our constituents, and we had enough time to visit with them and talk with them and learn what they were thinking about, and get their views on pending legislation.

I think we will agree that it has been a mistake in nearly every instance in which we have changed the Constitution, but it certainly was a great mistake when we changed the constitutional requirement that Congress adjourn every 2 years not later than the 4th of March.

Mr. BASS. I agree with the gentleman, and would say that that is one of the very few of what we call the good old days to which I would like to see Congress go back to.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, it can be said that had all the authorizing bills been adopted early in this session the Committee on Appropriations would have had their work done before July 1, last. But such is not the case. We have authorizing legislation yet pending. So as much as I dislike to continue these continuing extensions for appropriations, the facts are that our hands are tied, so to speak. There is nothing we can do now except adopt this continuing resolution. That is all there is to say about it, Mr. Speaker.

I realize many Members of the House are completely fed up with this constant extension of time, but conditions are

such that there is nothing we can do about it. The chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], has given the House the facts on the bills that have been passed by this House, and those that have been signed by the President, and those that are still to come before the House. So I must say only that the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives is doing everything it can to expedite the bills, in view of the circumstances that confront us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, certainly, I want to make it plain here today that I have no intention of criticising our great and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I have a great respect for him, and a great respect for his ability. Therefore, my criticism is not of him or of my good ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. I have a criticism to make and it is over the management and conduct of the affairs of the Congress of the United States. Under the Reorganization Act, this Congress is supposed to adjourn on July 30. But, we are continuing to operate on emergency resolutions because we have not finished our business yet. There is no national or international emergency. Then our fiscal year starts on July 1. Every Member of this House knows, and so do all committee chairmen, and authorizing committees as well, that all authorization bills must be passed in time so that the Committee on Appropriations can act upon the authorizations, prior to June 30 before the start of the following fiscal year. My quarrel is with the operation of the Congress—and the inept operation. I might say—and what the cause of it is, I may have a sneaky idea in my mind—is a delaying action. Because in the early part of this year, we must remember, we were so to speak, "fiddling away while Rome was burning." Our time was being wasted, and we were not authorizing legislation for appropriations. Now the President of the United States said, "Give me an overwhelming Democratic Congress and I will get the legislation through."

Well, he has an overwhelming Democratic Congress and what has happened in these last 3 years? Here we are going into the 5th month of fiscal year 1964, and we still have major appropriation bills to be acted upon. And then what happened under the rule—under the rules of this continuing resolution under which we will function, there are three factors by which departments of Government are operating—and as I said last week, I take a case in point, the foreign aid program. Under that program, the department is operating, on the basis of appropriation of last year of some \$4,100 million or \$4,200 million, and the House authorized \$3,500 million for 1964. The budget request was for \$4,900 million and later they cut it to \$4,500 million. So, consequently, today when we figure the aid program is operating on this

\$4,100 million—they can commit this Congress to \$4,100 million right today and probably are doing so even though we have not passed an appropriation bill. Now I doubt very seriously that any Member of this House can be in agreement with that kind of inept operation by a great legislative body such as the Congress of the United States.

Why do we have fiscal years starting July 1 if we are bringing in appropriation bills in October and November? You have the responsibility in the majority party on that side of the aisle. I say to the majority leader and I have asked twice, why has this legislation been held up to this date? We cannot just blame it on the other body, because our own authorization bills were late in coming through in this body this year. It seems to me we ought to get some answers as to what we will do and when we will do it.

The Democratic leadership and the administration are going to keep us here just be delaying the appropriation bills. Maybe that is the prospect they have in mind, that is, to keep us here to the first of the year. I do not know why, if there is legislation to be acted on, bring it out. Let us not have a Reorganization Act and say that we will adjourn on July 30 and then use an emergency that does not exist to keep us in session. I say it is wrong and is doing a great disservice to the American people, because the people all over the country and business all over the country is uncertain as to what we will do. They cannot function properly and carry on their affairs as they should with the constant threat of legislation being enacted by Congress.

The majority leader is here, and I wish he would answer some of those questions. The majority leader does not see fit to answer, so without any explanation I will ask for a rollcall and vote "no" in protest.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I think when it transpires that on three successive occasions we are called upon to pass continuing resolutions in order to keep the agencies and departments of the Government functioning, we should have more information than is available from the discussion so far. For example, I would like to know on what basis NASA is operating. Is NASA spending on the basis of last year's appropriation or on the basis of the current budget request? As I understand the public law which would be extended by this resolution, it provided that agencies and departments of the Government could continue to spend at the lower of three levels: The rate provided in any new public law which has been enacted, which obviously would be binding; or at a rate not in excess of last year's appropriations or the rate provided in the budget estimate—whichever is lower. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; is that correct? An agency of the Government which is operating under the previously enacted continuing resolutions would be restricted to the lower of two figures, that is, what was appropriated last year or the budget

estimate submitted this year. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the gentleman's inquiry and the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York, under this continuing resolution they cannot, in the interim, exceed last year's rate or this year's budget estimate rate, whichever is lower. And the stricture in the statute is, "Not in excess." The truth about the matter is that on these bills yet to become law we are saving money. If the bills were in effect as they passed the House in many instances they would be spending more money than they are allowed to spend under this continuing resolution. The only possible exception, an outstanding exception, as the gentleman indicates, is the foreign aid bill, but even in this case, as in all instances, there is a brake upon expenditure, a redeeming feature, because we provide as follows, and I read from the continuing resolution statute itself:

and expenditures therefrom shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

In other words, when they finally get their annual appropriation in the regular bill, they must take out of it all of the money that has been spent by them since the 30th day of June under the continuing resolutions. So in every instance, the longer we wait for the bill to become a law, the more money remains in the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. JONAS. That is just the point I wanted to make. Since 4 months of the new fiscal year have already passed and most agencies and departments have spent at last year's rate, which in almost every case is lower than this year's budget request, we should be saving money by delaying the passage of the new bills and passing continuing resolutions.

Since the agencies apparently are getting along without difficulty under the continuing resolutions, which hold current spending to last year's rate, I think we should take that into consideration in the appropriation bills yet to be considered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] has expired.

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONAS. For a period of 4 months, one-third of the new fiscal year, X agency has spent at the rate of last year's appropriation, which is substantially lower than the new budget. Why should we not properly take that into consideration in the bills that have not yet become law and make drastic reductions, because they have already operated under the old basis for one-third of the new fiscal year? Will that not give us an opportunity to make even greater reductions than we might have made had the bills been approved earlier in the year?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman and I are in perfect accord, because I recently made the statement here on the floor, that we expect to take every advantage of this slippage. And we expressed the hope that the Senate would do likewise as to the bills over there. And we trust that they will do that.

Of course so far as this moonoggie appropriation is concerned—I do not think we will ever again pass a bill that carries that much money for such a purpose. I might say, however, if the gentleman will permit me just one more word, in addition to the fact that we are entitled to save money in this interval that has not yet been taken care of, the President has assured us, repeatedly, that he will see that there is a reduction in expenditure, that a curb, a restraint, will be put upon expenditures. An appropriation is not an ironclad mandate to spend every dollar of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] has again expired.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I would say that the only way we can be absolutely sure that the money will be saved that was not spent during the past 4 months is to be in touch with the departments to see that they are not now operating on a deficiency basis.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, if I could believe that these departments would do that I would yell "Hooray" and a million hosannas. The gentleman knows, as well as I, whether we passed an appropriation bill now or 3 months ago, that they will use up all of it.

Mr. JONAS. That is the reason I think we ought to make sure that consideration is given in future bills to the fact that the agencies operated for 4 months at the old rate and the Government did not fold up.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we have an antideficiency law. It took a while to perfect it, but it has been perfected and it has teeth. That law, in concert with the provisions contained in the statute which I have just read to the Members of the House, is an absolute guarantee that the situation is adequately covered. And, of course, Congress should take advantage of every opportunity in this respect on the remaining bills.

(Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include certain tabulations.)

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I include a down-to-date reflec-

tion of the appropriation bills of the session and the corresponding budget requests.

There is no change from the last report, of October 10, because the situation is unchanged. We continue to mark time, awaiting the pleasure of the other body and, agreeable to the rules of the House, as indicated a few moments ago, the legislative authorization bills. The three regular bills remaining to be reported to the House—the public works bills, the military construction bill, and the foreign aid bill involve budget requests of about \$11,320,000,000. The customary closing supplemental requests are not in hand, but the probabilities are that they soon will be; the amounts are dependent.

\$184,869,965 has been cut from the budget on the supplementals in this session for the fiscal year 1963.

As to the main budget, for fiscal 1964, the four bills signed by the President, disposed of \$61,918,577,000 of his budget requests for appropriations. They were cut by \$2,229,557,000. And, in the aggregate, they are below comparable appropriations for fiscal 1963 by \$339,000,000.

The two bills awaiting conference, Agriculture and Legislative, involve \$6,550,973,450 of budget requests for appropriations.

Three bills—State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary, Independent Offices, and District of Columbia, are in the Senate.

The House has cut \$4,731,266,426 from the budget requests considered in the nine regular bills for fiscal 1964 and, assuredly, will put the knife to those remaining. The other body has registered some dissent and, with equal assurance, we may confidently assume further dis-

agreements with the actions of the House in those connections. But apparently nothing has yet developed to influence the earlier outlook for final congressional reductions, as to the regular bills for fiscal 1964, of the magnitude of \$5,400,000,000.

No estimate of the aggregate probability for the session can omit the approximately \$12,000,000,000—using a round amount because it does not stand still—of appropriations recurring automatically for fiscal 1964 under permanent law. That is not in the table to follow because it requires no annual action by the Congress. The principal expense is the interest on the national debt, tentatively estimated at \$10,020,000,000 in the January budget; it will probably be higher.

The substantiating details are in the following table:

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Oct. 28, 1963

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Bill number	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS								
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	\$508,172,000	Feb. 26 (No. 35)	\$508,172,000		Feb. 27	\$508,172,000		
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,641,607,106	Apr. 5 (No. 198)	988,756,506	—\$652,750,600	Apr. 10	1,438,691,506	—\$202,815,600	+\$449,935,000
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)		(-----)	(—500,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(—50,000,000)	(+450,000,000)
	All other	(1,141,507,106)		(988,756,506)	(—152,750,600)		(988,691,506)	(—152,815,600)	(—65,000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals.	2,149,679,106		1,496,928,506	—652,750,600		1,946,863,506	—202,815,600	+449,935,000
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS								
H.R. 5279	Interior	998,009,000	Mar. 28 (No. 177)	929,690,200	—68,318,800	Apr. 2	922,625,200	—75,383,800	—7,065,000
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(—7,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(—7,000,000)	
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)			(—17,500,000)			(—17,500,000)	
H.R. 5366	Treasury-Post Office	6,146,842,000	Apr. 1 (No. 179)	5,997,026,000	—149,816,000	Apr. 4	5,997,026,000	—149,816,000	
H.R. 5888	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	5,759,489,000	Apr. 25 (No. 246)	5,449,988,000	—309,501,000	Apr. 30	5,449,981,000	—309,508,000	—7,000
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6,368,755,000	June 3 (No. 355)	5,979,457,000	—389,298,000	June 6	5,979,457,000	—389,298,000	
	Loan authorizations	3(855,000,000)		3(855,000,000)			3(855,000,000)		
H.R. 6868	Legislative	148,580,245	June 6 (No. 369)	140,038,919	—8,541,326	June 11	140,038,919	—8,541,326	
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	2,159,891,900	June 14 (No. 388)	1,851,269,900	—308,622,000	June 18	1,851,269,900	—308,622,000	
H.R. 7179	Defense	49,014,237,000	June 21 (No. 439)	47,092,209,000	—1,922,028,000	June 26	47,082,009,000	—1,932,228,000	—10,200,000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(289,581,800)	July 8 (No. 499)	(284,286,800)	(—5,295,000)	July 11	(284,286,800)	(—5,295,000)	
	Federal payment	34,868,000		32,868,000	—2,000,000		32,868,000	—2,000,000	
	Loan authorizations	(8,000,000)		(8,000,000)			(8,000,000)		
H.R. 8747	Independent offices	14,658,588,000	Oct. 7 (No. 824)	13,102,818,700	—1,555,769,300	Oct. 10	13,102,718,700	—1,555,869,300	—100,000
	Total, 1964 appropriations.	85,289,260,145		80,575,365,719	—4,713,894,426		80,557,993,719	—4,731,266,426	—17,372,000
	Total, all appropriations.	87,438,939,251		82,072,294,225	—5,366,645,026		82,604,857,225	—4,934,082,026	+432,563,000
	Total, loan authorizations.	(876,000,000)		(869,000,000)	(—7,000,000)		(869,000,000)	(—7,000,000)	
	Total, contract authority.	(17,500,000)			(—17,500,000)			(—17,500,000)	

Footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 1st sess., as of Oct. 28, 1963—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Bill number	Title	Senate						
		Budget estimates to Senate	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—	
							Budget estimates	House action
1963 SUPPLEMENTALS								
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	\$508,172,000	Feb. 28 (No. 9)	\$508,172,000	Mar. 4	\$508,172,000		
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,652,300,456	Apr. 24 (No. 155)	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	—163,616,615	+49,922,335
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)		(450,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(—50,000,000)	
	All other	(1,152,300,456)		(1,036,096,841)		(1,038,683,841)	(—113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2,160,472,456		1,994,268,841		1,996,855,841	—163,616,615	+49,992,335
1964 APPROPRIATIONS								
H.R. 5279	Interior	998,009,000	May 22 (No. 181)	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	—18,315,600	+57,068,200
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(—7,000,000)	
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)					(—17,500,000)	
H.R. 5366	Treasury-Post Office	6,146,842,000	May 3 (No. 168)	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	—77,375,750	+72,440,250
H.R. 5888	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	5,759,489,000	Aug. 1 (No. 383)	5,494,627,250	Aug. 7	5,495,827,250	—263,661,750	+45,846,250
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6,368,755,000	Sept. 12 (No. 497)	6,046,738,340	Sept. 30	6,047,988,340	—320,766,660	+68,531,340
	Loan authorizations	³ (855,000,000)		³ (880,000,000)		³ (880,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)
H.R. 6868	Legislative	182,218,450	June 25 (No. 313)	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	—13,945,381	+28,234,150
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary							
H.R. 7179	Defense	49,014,237,000	Sept. 17 (No. 502)	47,371,407,000	Sept. 24	47,339,707,000	—1,674,530,000	+257,698,000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia							
	Federal payment							
	Loan authorizations							
H.R. 8747	Independent offices							
	Total, 1964 appropriations	68,469,550,450		66,134,355,309		66,100,955,309	—2,368,595,141	+529,818,190
	Total, all appropriations	70,630,022,906		68,128,624,150		68,097,811,150	—2,532,211,756	+579,810,525
	Total, loan authorizations	(868,000,000)		(886,000,000)		(886,000,000)	(+18,000,000)	(+25,000,000)
	Total, contract authority	(17,500,000)					(—17,500,000)	

Bill number	Title	Conference			Public Law	
		Date filed and report number	Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date	Number	Date approved
	1963 SUPPLEMENTALS					
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture		\$508,172,000		88-1	Mar. 6
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	May 6 (No. 275)	1,467,430,491	—\$184,869,965	88-25	May 17
	Public works acceleration	May 31 (No. 290)	(450,000,000)	(—50,000,000)		
	All other		(1,017,430,491)	(—134,869,965)		
	Total, 1963 supplementals		1,975,602,491	—184,869,965		
	1964 APPROPRIATIONS					
H.R. 5279	Interior	July 11 (No. 551)	952,456,500	—45,552,500	88-79	July 26
	Loan authorization		(6,000,000)	(—7,000,000)		
	Contract authority			(—17,500,000)		
H.R. 5366	Treasury-Post Office	May 28 (No. 353)	6,045,466,000	—101,376,000	88-39	June 13
H.R. 5888	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	Sept. 25 (No. 774)	5,471,087,500	—288,401,500	88-136	Oct. 11
H.R. 6754	Agriculture					
	Loan authorizations					
H.R. 6868	Legislative					
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary					
H.R. 7179	Defense	Oct. 7 (No. 812)	47,220,010,000	—1,794,227,000	88-149	Oct. 17
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia					
	Federal payment					
	Loan authorizations					
H.R. 8747	Independent offices					
	Total, 1964 appropriations		59,689,020,000	—2,229,557,000		
	Total, all appropriations		61,664,622,491	—2,414,426,965		
	Total, loan authorizations		(6,000,000)	(—7,000,000)		
	Total, contract authority			(—17,500,000)		

¹ Tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$11,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964;² Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.³ Includes \$630,000,000 for Farmers Home Administration loans currently made from loan repayments in lieu of former practice of new public debt borrowings from Treasury.⁴ Excludes Senate items.

Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)—3 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1964 VERSUS 3 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1963, WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. Speaker, in conformity with our practice, I include, under leave granted, for the information of Members and others a tabulation of budget receipts and expenditures in the first 3 months of fiscal year 1964 with pertinent comparisons.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the normal pattern of budget receipts shows September, December, March, and June as peak months; and receipts in the first half—July–December—of the fiscal year are usually lower than in the January–June second half.

Budget revenues were officially estimated at \$86,900,000,000 in last January's budget for the current fiscal year 1964, which, if realized, would exceed fiscal year 1963 revenues by \$543,000,000. That is the last official budget estimate; the Secretary of the Treasury updated the figure to \$88,800,000,000 in testimony on the tax bill, which, if realized, would mean a \$2,443,000,000 increase over actual fiscal 1963 revenues. In any event, in the first 3 months of the fiscal year—a relatively low collection period, actual budget revenues amounted to \$20,932,000,000, slightly higher than the corresponding 3 months of last year.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures were officially projected in the budget last January at \$98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 which, if held to, would represent an increase of \$6,212,000,000 over the fiscal 1963 budget expenditures. On a straight monthly basis, it would mean an average of \$8,233,000,000 per month, in contrast to which the expenditures in the first 3 months, July–September, averaged \$7,994,000,000 which in turn compares with \$7,707,000,000 in the corresponding 3 months last year; the national defense monthly average was up \$142,000,000 over a year ago and the monthly average for all other items—nondefense—was \$145,000,000 higher.

But in his August testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury informally presented a revised estimate of \$98,000,000,000 budget expenditures for fiscal 1964, in contrast to the original estimate of \$98,802,000,000; supporting details are

not available. This would represent an increase over fiscal 1963 of \$5,410,000,000. Expenditures in the first 3 months, July–September, were \$863,000,000 higher than those for the same 3 months last year; both defense and nondefense were up.

As in all past budgets, the original January budget expenditure—disbursements—estimate of \$98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 represented a composite of first, estimated disbursements in fiscal 1964 from appropriations made in prior years—\$42,353,000,000, or approximately 43 percent, and therefore not directly affected by current congressional action on the 1964 appropriation bills; second, \$1,202,000,000 estimated first-year expenditure in fiscal 1964 associated with proposals for new legislation; third, roughly \$11,781,000,000 estimated to be expended from permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session; fourth, thus leaving only about \$43,466,000,000 of the total \$98,802,000,000 original spending estimate for 1964 subject to direct action in the appropriation bills of the current session.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST, AND ALL OTHER PROGRAMS

Both the State of the Union and Budget messages, last January, emphasized the fact that the expenditure estimates and programs for fiscal 1964 were so constructed that total proposed administrative budget expenditure for all programs other than national defense, space, and interest were slightly below the fiscal 1963 level—as then forecast—for such programs. The original net budget for fiscal 1964 for such other programs was \$29,066,000,000. In the meantime, actual expenditures in fiscal 1963 for comparable purposes did not go as high as forecast in last January's budget, with the result that the \$29,066,000,000 stands as an increase of \$1,747,000,000 over fiscal 1963 rather than being below that year. In the first 3 months—July–September of fiscal 1964, expenditures for such other programs were \$7,664,000,000—about \$107,000,000 below the corresponding expenditure in July–September of last year.

SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Whether the budget deficit is the \$9,200,000,000 informally projected by the Secretary before the Ways and Means Committee, and mentioned in the President's letter of August 19, or some other amount, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last

34 years. And the President advises that the next budget, for fiscal 1965, will also be in the red. And no assurance is at hand that the fiscal 1966 budget will be balanced. We have not had a balanced budget since fiscal 1960. In summary here are the official administrative budget figures of the last 3 years:

	From July 1, 1961, to date	For 3 fiscal years 1962–64
Fiscal 1962 (from July 1, 1961).....	\$6,378,000,000	\$6,378,000,000
Fiscal 1963.....	6,233,000,000	6,233,000,000
Fiscal 1964 (3 months to Sept. 30, 1963).....	3,052,000,000	-----
Fiscal 1964 (estimate mentioned in President's Aug. 19 letter).....	-----	9,200,000,000
Total, as above.....	15,663,000,000	21,811,000,000

And in total, actual budget expenditures in the fiscal year closed on June 30 last, and those now informally projected by the Secretary for the current fiscal year 1964, compare with certain earlier years, as follows:

	Budget spending	
	Over fiscal 1961	Over fiscal 1954
Fiscal 1963 actual:		
National defense.....	\$5,249,000,000	\$5,757,000,000
Other than national defense.....	5,826,000,000	19,296,000,000
Total, 1963 over.....	11,075,000,000	25,053,000,000
Fiscal 1964 estimate:		
Total, 1964 estimate over.....	16,485,000,000	30,463,000,000

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, after 3 months of budget operations in the current fiscal year 1964 the total public debt, both direct and guaranteed, stood at \$307,328,111,300.33 and compares with certain earlier dates as shown in the following table:

Federal public debt—Direct and guaranteed
[Fiscal years]

	1954	1961	1962	1963	1964 ¹
1. The debt at end of period (in billions).....	\$271.3	\$289.2	\$298.6	\$306.5	\$307.3
2. Amount per capita (in dollars).....	1,670.0	1,575.0	1,600.0	1,619.0	1,617.0
3. Average for a family of 4 (in dollars).....	6,680.0	6,300.0	6,400.0	6,476.0	6,468.0

¹ At Sept. 30, 1963.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the following table elaborates the receipt and expenditure situation more fully:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget) 3 months of fiscal 1964 versus 3 months of fiscal 1963 and comparisons with full-year estimates

[In million of dollars]

	Actual for 3 months (to September 30)			Budget estimates for all of fiscal 1964 compared to actual result for all of fiscal 1963			1964 estimates over 1963	
	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1963	1964 compared to 1963	Budget estimates for 1964 ¹	Informal Treasury revision ²	Actual, 1963	Original estimates over 1963	Informal Treasury revision over 1963
1. Budget receipts (net)-----	20,932	20,708	+223	86,900	88,800	86,357	+543	+2,443
2. Budget expenditures (net):								
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)-----	12,858	12,433	+425	55,433	(3)	52,743	+2,690	(3)
(b) Other than national defense-----	11,125	10,687	+438	43,369	(3)	39,847	+3,522	(3)
Total expenditures, net-----	23,983	23,120	+863	98,802	98,000	92,590	+6,212	+5,410
3. Net surplus (+), or deficit (-)-----	-3,052	-2,412	-640	-11,902	-9,200	-6,233	+5,669	+2,967
4. Average monthly expenditure:								
(a) National defense-----	4,286	4,144	+142	4,619	(3)	4,395	+224	(3)
(b) Other than national defense-----	3,708	3,563	+145	3,614	(3)	3,320	+294	(3)
Total monthly average-----	7,994	7,707	+287	8,233	8,167	7,715	+518	+452
1. Dividing net budget expenditures on the basis emphasized by the budget message of January 1963:								
(a) National defense-----	12,858	12,433	+425	55,433	(3)	52,743	+2,690	(3)
(b) Space-----	843	463	+380	4,200	(3)	2,552	+1,648	(3)
(c) Interest-----	2,618	2,453	+165	10,103	(3)	9,976	+127	(3)
(d) All other expenditures-----	7,664	7,771	-107	29,066	(3)	27,319	+1,747	(3)
Total expenditures, net-----	23,983	23,120	+863	98,802	98,000	92,590	+6,212	+5,410

¹ As per original budget, January 17, 1963.

² Given by Secretary of Treasury to Ways and Means Committee in connection with tax bill (August 1963).

³ No breakdowns available.

⁴ That is to say, these 2 estimates represent a projected deficit in fiscal 1964 higher, by \$5,669,000,000 and \$2,967,000,000, respectively, than the deficit actually experienced in fiscal 1963.

Sources: Monthly Treasury statement for Sept. 30, 1963; budget for 1964; and monthly Treasury statement for June 30, 1963.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I realize, and I am sure we all realize, that we have no course other than to follow to adopt this resolution. But it seems to me that as we have moved along, not this year alone but in years past, by the adoption of these extensions of appropriations from month to month, we are engaging in a bad practice, something that lends itself to bad government and poor management.

I have reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that despite the intent and the purpose of these resolutions, the agencies of Government are not strictly adhering to them. I realize too that whatever they expend between July 1 and the final adoption of the appropriation bills, must be taken out of their annual appropriation for the fiscal year involved. But it seems to me that until and unless they put their houses in order in adherence to these resolutions, which are applicable on the basis of last year's figures and last year's appropriations, we must insist and see to it that the intent and purpose of these resolutions receives the adherence of each and every department and agency covered.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Very briefly.

Mr. BECKER. Very briefly. I would certainly go along with what the gentleman has said, because he leads me in this field. But we have not gotten one single reason here or explanation as to why this should be, why these things have been held up so the Committee on Appropriations could not get a chance to do its work.

Mr. OSTERTAG. As has been explained—and I think the major reasons which I believe can be accepted, but the

main reason why many of these appropriations have not been enacted into law for the full fiscal year is because they lack authorization of certain projects or programs for this fiscal year.

Permit me to say at this point that I am not sure how we can correct this situation. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, our system is so wrong that this continuing practice will go on indefinitely. As I say, it is bad government and bad practice. Until we can find a way whereby these authorizations are either adopted or established the year before or early in the year so that we are in a position to appropriate funds as of the fiscal year, we are bound to have more of the same.

I do not know whether it would be appropriate or proper or legal to change our system of requiring authorizations the previous year as to the year in which we are operating, but something like that might, in and of itself, correct this bad situation.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman suggests we have a cutoff date on authorizations? It seems a paradox to have authorizations continue the year round and then have a cutoff date as to the appropriations. In that way we have to wait all year long to see what the authorizations are going to be. It might be that we could require that all appropriations ought to be based upon authorizations that are passed, say, by July 1.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] have something like that in mind?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I had in mind that

we might require all authorizations to be accepted and adopted by the Congress a year prior to the enactment of the appropriation bill involved.

Mr. PILLION. That is very simple.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question: First, what effect will this procedure have upon the formulation of the 1965 budget? How can the departments and agencies formulate a budget for 1965 under this sort of procedure, and if they cannot formulate a budget what kind of a bind are we getting into now with respect to the movement of appropriation legislation next year? Can anybody shed any light on what is happening to the budgetary procedure as of now when those responsible ought to be formulating a 1965 budget?

I would like to ask one other question since I did not get an answer to the first one. I should like to know whether this means the continuing resolution to November 30, 1963, will result in adjournment of the Congress sine die on December 1, 1963?

Mr. CANNON. I am certain the gentleman knows as much about the last question as any of us in the House. As to the first inquiry, we have three departments of Government, the judicial, the executive, and the legislative. From all appearances each department is to judge whether it is handling its own responsibilities adequately.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman see any encouragement in this 1-month continuing resolution that we can be out of here on or about December 1?

Mr. CANNON. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. GROSS. And neither would I.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the House joint resolution we are now considering.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the House joint resolution.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 11, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—279

Abele	Dague	Jensen
Adair	Daniels	Joelson
Albert	Davis, Ga.	Johansen
Alger	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Wis.
Anderson	Dawson	Jonas
Andrews	Dent	Jones, Ala.
Arends	Denton	Jones, Mo.
Ashley	Derwinski	Karsten
Ashmore	Dole	Karth
Aspinall	Dowdy	Kastenmeier
Auchincloss	Dulski	Kee
Baker	Duncan	Keith
Baldwin	Edmondson	Kilgore
Barry	Edwards	King, Calif.
Bass	Elliott	Kirwan
Bates	Ellsworth	Knox
Beckworth	Everett	Kunkel
Belcher	Fallon	Kyi
Bell	Fascell	Laird
Bennett, Fla.	Findley	Langen
Bennett, Mich.	Finnegan	Lankford
Berry	Fisher	Latta
Betts	Flood	Lennon
Blatnik	Fogarty	Libonati
Bolton	Forrester	Lindsay
Frances P.	Fraser	Lipscomb
Bow	Frelinghuysen	Lloyd
Brademas	Fulton, Pa.	Long, Md.
Bray	Gathings	McClary
Brock	Gialmo	McCulloch
Bromwell	Gilbert	McFall
Brooks	Glenn	McIntire
Broomfield	Goodell	McLoskey
Brotzman	Goodling	McMillan
Brown, Ohio	Grabowski	Mahon
Broyhill, Va.	Gray	Marsh
Broyhill Va.	Gross	Martin, Calif.
Burke	Grover	Martin, Nebr.
Burleson	Gubser	Mathias
Byrne, Pa.	Hagan, Ga.	Matsunaga
Byrnes, Wis.	Haley	Matthews
Cameron	Halpern	Meador
Cannon	Hanna	Michel
Casey	Hansen	Miller, Calif.
Cederberg	Hardy	Milliken
Celler	Harrison	Mills
Chelf	Harsha	Moorhead
Chenoweth	Hawkins	Morgan
Clawson, Del	Healey	Morris
Cleveland	Hébert	Morrison
Cohelan	Hechler	Morse
Collier	Hemphill	Morton
Colmer	Holifield	Mosher
Conte	Holland	Moss
Corbett	Horton	Murphy, Ill.
Corman	Hosmer	Murphy, N.Y.
Cunningham	Huddleston	Murray
Curtin	Ichord	Natcher

Nedzi	Rostenkowski
Nelsen	Roush
Norblad	Roybal
O'Hara, Ill.	Rumsfeld
O'Hara, Mich.	Ryan, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.	St Germain
Olson, Minn.	Saylor
Ostertag	Schadeberg
Passman	Schenck
Patman	Schwelker
Perkins	Schwengel
Pike	Scott
Pillion	Secrest
Pirnie	Selden
Poage	Senner
Poff	Sheppard
Pool	Shipley
Price	Shriver
Pucinski	Sibal
Purcell	Sickles
Ralns	Sikes
Randall	Sisk
Reid, N.Y.	Slack
Reuss	Smith, Calif.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Iowa
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Va.
Rich	Snyder
Rivers, Alaska	Staebler
Roberts, Ala.	Staggers
Robison	Steed
Rodino	Stephens
Rogers, Colo.	Stratton
Rogers, Fla.	Stubblefield
Rogers, Tex.	Sullivan
Rooney, N.Y.	Talcott
Rooney, Pa.	Teague, Calif.

NAYS—11

Ashbrook
Becker
Beermann
Clancy

Derounian
Devine
O'Konski
Short

Slier
Wharton
Wilson, Ind.

NOT VOTING—142

Abbltt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Avery
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Battin
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Oliver P.
Bonner
Brown, Calif.
Bruce
Buckley
Burkhalter
Burton
Cahill
Carey
Chamberlain
Clark
Clausen
Don H.
Cooley
Cramer
Curtis
Daddario
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dwyer
Evins
Farbsteln
Felghan
Fino
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher

Garmatz
Gary
Gibbons
Gill
Gonzalez
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Hall
Halleck
Harding
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Hull
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kling, N.Y.
Kluczyński
Kornegay
Landrum
Leggett
Lesinski
Long, La.
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
May
Miller, N.Y.

Minish
Minshali
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Multer
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Philbin
Pilcher
Powell
Quile
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Onge
Schneebell
Shelley
Skubitz
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Utt
Wallhauser
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Wright

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Curtis of Missouri
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Harding with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Stinson.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Baring.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Gibbons.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Flynt.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Hagen of California.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Gili.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Gonzalez.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Fuiton of Tennessee.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Piicher.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Fuqua.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Gurney.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. White with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Shelley with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Pepper with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Taft.
Mr. St. Onge with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Ryan of New York with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. King of New York.
Mr. Minish with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Farbsteln with Mr. Bruce.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Feighan with Don. H. Clausen.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Gary of Virginia with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mrs. May.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Minshali.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Quile.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Fino.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO GRANT ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 314 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 103, 88th Congress, the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on a Science Data

So the joint resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Nix with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Kluczyński with Mr. Utt.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Clark with Mr. McDade.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Foreman.



Public Law 88-162
88th Congress, H. J. Res. 782
October 30, 1963

Joint Resolution

77 STAT. 281.

Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution Continuing Appropriations, of August 28, 1963 (Public Law 88-109), is hereby amended by striking out "October 31, 1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 30, 1963".

1964.
Ante, p. 134.

Approved Oct. 30, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 109 (1963):

Oct. 28: Considered and passed House.

Oct. 28: Considered and passed Senate.

3540 E

U.S.D.A.
SEA/TIS
LAW LIBRARY
ROOM 1406 SOUTH
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250